

DETAILED ACTION

Allowable Subject Matter

1. Claims 1-20 are allowed over the prior art of record.

2. The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:

As per the independent claims, the claim recitations pertaining to setting global commands in the dictionary as recognizable or unrecognizable within a recognition process of speech recognition, according to operation states of the application program which said each word is tied to, is not explicitly taught by the prior art of record. For example, Applicant's FIG. 4 "State" column indicates the operation states (e.g., Installed, Activated or Interacting) that each global command (e.g., Help, Top Menu) is recognizable. In looking at FIG. 4's row 1, as an example, if the program "1" (designated within the Corresponding Application ID column) is a currently-interacting program, then program "1"s Help global command would be currently recognizable (indicated by the Valid designation within FIG. 4's Valid/Invalid column). In contrast, looking at FIG. 4's row 2, as another example, if the program "3" (designated within the Corresponding Application ID column) is not a currently-interacting program, then program "3"s Help global command would not be currently recognizable (indicated by the Invalid designation within FIG. 4's Valid/Invalid column).

With respect to the prior art of record, Schmid et al. does (at least partially) pertain to speech recognition and does contain one or more "lexicons" (assumed as "dictionaries" for a

moment, for the present discussions), Schmid et al.'s lexicons appear to be used for "text-to-speech" (TTS) functions (not Applicant's opposite speech recognition). That is, Schmid et al.'s lexicon appears to be mainly (if not entirely) a voice/speech synthesis dictionary. See Schmid et al.'s column 10, lines 24-last line, for example. Nowhere does Schmid et al. disclose or suggest any type of arrangement pertaining to a "control unit which selectively sets each word of global commands in the dictionary as recognizable or unrecognizable within a recognition process of speech recognition, according to operation states of the application program which said each word is tied to". Hirayama et al. arrangement appears to pertain to only a single speech recognition program being run within a navigation apparatus. At best, Hirayama et al. sets phrases valid/invalid according to a current menu screen (but not differing programs).

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

3. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Opsasnick, telephone number (571)272-7623, who is available Tuesday-Thursday, 9am-4pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. Richemond Dorvil, can be reached at (571)272-7602. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Michael N. Opsasnick/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2626
10/21/08